DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 230 SP 031 109

AUTHOR Etheridge, Carol Plata; And Others
TITLE Analysis and Practices of Teaching: Desciption of a Course.
INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., TN. Center of Excellence in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Dec 88
NOTE 39p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Course Content; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; Lesson Plans; *Masters Degrees; Microteaching; Preservice Teacher Education; Secondary Education; *Teaching Experience; *Teaching Methods; Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS Memphis State University TN; *Paideia Proposal

ABSTRACT

An introductory teacher preparation course based on Adler's Paideia concepts was examined for documentation of course content, purposes, and student reactions. Data were collected through ethnographic observations of course classes, interviews with students and professors, and examination of readings for the course. The course, "Analysis and Practices of Teaching," was team-taught by two professors to 25 graduate students beginning a 15-month Master of Arts in Teaching program for certification as secondary teachers. The course schedule included lectures, seminars, and videotaped microteaching sessions. Diverse teaching strategies were explored as the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM) and Mortimer Adler's Paideia concepts were scrutinized and practiced. Analysis and evaluation of learning and performance were achieved through joint efforts of the professors and students. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307230

Analysis and Practices of Teaching: Description of a Course

by
Carol Plata Etheridge
Patricia Lea W. Crocker
Anne C. Troutman

Center of Excellence in Teacher Education
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152

Barbara Burch, Director

December, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. P. Etheridge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP031109

Abstract

An introductory teacher preparation course based on Adler's Paideia concepts was examined for documentation of course content, purposes, and student reactions. Data were collected through ethnographic observations of course classes, interviews with students and professors, and examination of readings for the course. The course, "Analysis and Practices of Teaching," was team taught by two professors to 25 graduate students beginning a 15-month Master of Arts in Teaching program for certification as secondary teachers. The course schedule included lectures, seminars, and video-taped micro-teaching sessions. Diverse teaching strategies were explored as the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM) and Mortimer Adler's Paideia concepts were scrutinized and practiced. Analysis and evaluation of learning and performance were achieved through joint efforts of the professors and students.

Contents

Purpose and Procedure	4
MAT Cohort of 1988-89	5
Goals and Objectives	6
Paideia Program	8
Didactic Teaching	9
Coaching	10
Seminars	11
Analysis of Teaching	12
Lesson Plans	12
Tennessee Instructional Model	13
Practice of Teaching	16
Class Structure and Procedure	16
Problems	18
Professional Participation	19
Student Participation	20
Cooperative Team Teaching	22
Evaluation	23
Closure	23
Summary	24
Discussion	25
References	27
Appendix A	28
Appendix B	29
Appendix C	32
Appendix D	33

Analysis and Practices of Teaching:

Description of a Course

A new cohort of Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) at Memphis State University begins preparation for classroom teaching in June of each year. Over a 15-month period, the Fellows (students) work together intensively, learning and practicing in university classroom settings with their peers and in public secondary school classrooms with experienced teachers and their students. Through sharing of ideas and working together to solve problems they create a support group for the period during which they approach and enter the teaching profession.

Each M.A.T. cohort has a faculty coordinator who oversees the group throughout the 15-month program. The coordinator also conducts a seminar concurrent with the internship and team teaches the "Analysis and Practice of Teaching" class during the first summer of the program.

Upon completion of the program students have satisfied Tennessee requirements for teacher certification and attained the Master of Arts in Teaching.

Purpose and Procedure

The purpose of this paper is to examine and describe one course component of the M.A.T. program, "Analysis and Practice of

Teaching" (A&P). Commonly called "Micro-teaching" by the students, A&P is the keystone of the pedagogical coursework in the M.A.T. program.

Information about the A&P class was gathered through ethnographic observations and interviews during the summer of 1988. The class syllabus, handouts, exams, and assigned readings were examined and classroom activities were observed. Instructors and students were interviewed several times in order to clarify and verify observers' perceptions of class activities. Interviews and observations were recorded as fieldnotes in the format described by Spradley (1970); condensed fieldnotes were taken during observations and immediately following interviews. These were transformed into expanded notes within 24 hours of data collection. For accessibility fieldnote protocols were numerically coded to identify sequence, page number, and paragraph. To insure accuracy and completeness, a preliminary description of the course was drafted and presented to the instructors for scrutiny and feedback. Finally a full description of the class emerged, incorporating their revisions and comments.

M.A.T. Cohort of 1988-1989

In June 1988 a new cohort of 25 M.A.T. Fellows was formed. Seventeen of them held undergraduate degrees earned in 1987 or 1988; one graduated before 1980. Their mean age was 26.5, ranging between 21 and 39; two thirds of the group were under 24. There were two black females, seventeen white females, and six white males. Their areas of specialization included English, speech, the sciences, mathematics, social sciences, art, and home economics.

Twenty-one of these students had received no previous training in classroom procedures. The primary course goal was to familiarize students with local system educational goals, the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM) (Tennessee State Department of Education, 1985), a variety of instructional strategies gleaned from the effective teaching literature, and classroom management techniques.

Throughout the program, particularly in the "Analysis and Practice of Teaching" classes, the students benefitted from positive and realistic guidance of Dr. Tessa Andrews[1], program coordinator, and Dr. Dianne Amhurst, team teaching partner. The combined experiences of these two professors in regular and special education, assessment, and administration qualified them as teacher educators. They served as role models and mentors, teaching and demonstrating effective methods within a highly motivational learning environment.

Individually and collectively, this cohort was energetic, sociable, and enthusiastic. Observers, interviewers, and instructors reported them to be eager to learn and cheerfully cooperative.

Goals and Objectives

A&P was designed to introduce and teach the fundamental concepts of lesson planning and presentation. In addition to other summer coursework in assessment, reading, and special education, the group met with Drs. Andrews and Amhurst at least nine hours

[1]Names have been changed to protect anonymity.

each week for nine weeks in "Analysis and Practices of Teaching." The weekly format for the class was as follows: 3 days, Lecture/Didactic (1.5 hours each day); 1 day, Discussion/Seminar (1.5 hours); 1 day, Micro-teaching (3.5 hours). Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday lecture content centered around history and philosophy of education, techniques of lesson planning and delivery, and general state and local guidelines. Thursday discussions were seminars styled after Mortimer Adler's (1982) Paideia Proposal, addressing topics of educational impact. On Fridays the M.A.T. Fellows divided into two groups and met with either Dr. Amhurst or Dr. Andrews to present 10-20 minute lessons in their chosen subject areas, practicing styles of direct instruction, discussion, and lecture. Micro-teaching lessons were accompanied by written, detailed lesson plans and were video-taped for analysis and evaluation by students and professors. Additional course requirements included special projects, term papers, and mid-term and final examinations (see Appendix A).

Dr. Andrews' long-range goals for this "Analysis and Practices" class were stated in June: (a) mastery of the state approved written lesson plan format, (b) mastery of the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM), (c) development of competency in discovery learning, discussion, and questioning techniques, (d) discrimination between types of content and selection of methods appropriate to particular content. (Students should learn that there is not always one right answer, that there may be several satisfactory alternatives available.)

Specifically, each week's three days of didactic instruction included the following topics:

1. Lesson planning
2. Behavioral objectives
3. Bloom's Taxonomy of Behavioral Objectives
4. Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM)
5. Direct Instruction
6. Error Analysis
7. Lesson Revisions
8. Lecture Techniques
9. Modeling
10. Coaching
11. Questioning
12. Discovery Learning
13. Discussion
14. Seminars
15. Interdisciplinary teaching

To provide a philosophical framework for integrating these concepts, the Fellows were required to read assignments from Adler's three books, The Paideia Program (1984), Paideia Problems, and Possibilities (1983), and The Paideia Proposal (1982), and from other selected materials.

Paideia Program--Concept, Description, Rationale

The "Analysis and Practices" class was structured according to recommendations in the Paideia Program (see Appendix B) and was developed to integrate prescriptions of TIM within this

framework. According to Adler, the Paideia Program is an educational manifesto calling for radical reform of basic schooling in the United States. It is designed to replace the elitist nature of United States' schools with a truly democratic system that aims to improve the quality of basic schooling and to make that quality accessible to all children. The central focus is to coordinate knowledge and understanding via coaching exercises and supervised practice. Teachers facilitate the learning of knowledge, skills, and insights through didactic teaching, coaching of skills toward habit development, and Socratic teaching by questioning and by conducting discussions of the answers elicited.

Didactic instruction, coaching, and seminars were components recommended by Adler in his Paideia concept and incorporated by the A&P professors into A&P class activities as they taught, demonstrated, and encouraged the Fellows to use them.

Didactic Teaching

Didactic instruction may be presented in writing or orally; both modes require active (thinking) participation of the students. Because reading skills developed in the first twelve years of schooling may be adequate for this task, emphasis is on the teacher's use of effective oral presentation.

In telling or lecturing, the successful teacher must consider the following factors:

1. Time in class should be equally divided between telling and questioning.

2. Presentations should be rhetorical as well as logical. Enthusiasm and imaginative utterance should convey orderly facts and ideas.
3. Wonder and discovery are needed to stimulate interest and attention.
4. Lectures should be neither too difficult nor too simple for the students. They should be told readily understood material side by side with things that require effort to understand.
5. Questions and answers should be generated by both teacher and students.
6. Opening remarks should include explanation of what is to be learned and why. The teacher is as an actor on stage, changing pace and voice to inspire students' continuing interest.
7. The amount of material covered should depend upon the ability of the group to absorb it rather than upon a predetermined assumption of how much is appropriate. Use of any direct instruction model, including TIM, is considered to be didactic teaching.

Coaching

Coaching is supervised instruction during which the teacher combines telling and questioning to enhance the effectiveness of trial and error learning and the building of self-checking habits. Seven essential conditions for effective coaching were enumerated:

1. The teacher must know the student in terms of characteristic cognitive and affective traits.

2. The students's work is the teaching material, displaying the skill to be criticized.
3. Immediate and thorough correction is necessary.
4. Identification of why something is wrong is essential to learning.
5. The level of abstraction varies with the age, nature, and/or experience of the student.
6. Boring, painful drill is often necessary.
7. Availability of time and limited class size are essential.

Seminars

Seminars at the secondary level should occur once or twice a week for a minimum of 90 minutes and usually for about two hours. The room arrangement should be conducive to conversation, argument, and debate. Circular or semi-circular patterns are recommended. Materials on which the discussions are based are books or other works of art. The teacher's role is to introduce and define topics, ask leading questions, and to keep the discussion on track. Discussions should never be used to disguise didactic instruction; the purpose is to provide an environment in which understanding and insight may grow as a result of the thought processes and communications of the students.

The elements of the Paideia Program, didactic teaching, coaching, and seminars, were modeled by the professors as they were taught to the M.A.T. students in the A&P classes. Realistically recognizing the limitations in the structure of secondary schools, the A&P professors acknowledged that "pure" seminars may not be

possible. Nevertheless, students were encouraged to incorporate this teaching method into their classes.

Analysis of Teaching

The analysis portion of A&P consisted of three class meetings weekly. Although lectures were packed with information, the learning atmosphere was comfortable and informal. Students' desks were always arranged in a horseshoe pattern, pairs, or small groups to facilitate activities and the exchange of ideas. Amusing anecdotes elicited laughter as they accented important facts and ideas in the lectures. In addition, students vicariously experienced a wide gamut of classroom situations shared by the guiding professors. Dr. Andrews emphasized that each new teacher would take a unique style and personality to the classroom despite the necessary employment of deliberate techniques to meet curriculum requirements. Andrews' indefatigable humor and dedication demonstrated her belief that fun and hard work are inseparable as the successful teacher directs successful learners. One recommendation for preventing deterioration of learning and teaching was that the teachers vary their presentation styles. Didactic instruction, according to Andrews and Amhurst, should be fused with and supported by coaching, discussion, and independent or group activities.

Lesson Plans

The M.A.T. Fellows learned a lesson plan format similar to that used by local school systems. They received forms (see

Appendix C) on which spaces were provided for writing goals and objectives, for listing materials and procedures, and for explaining evaluation procedures and activities. As the students were walked through the thinking processes and behaviors for analyzing tasks and developing plans, Andrews and Amhurst employed the skills and instructional methods being taught. They emphasized the usefulness of task analysis in planning and noted that while it is not always necessary to analyze tasks in great depth, breaking learning tasks into component parts is an important problem-solving technique for teachers.

Tennessee Instructional Model

The professors explained the development and use of TIM and told the Fellows that they would be required by local Tennessee systems to know and use it when teaching in the state. One danger of TIM may be the accompanying idea that all teachers should teach alike, they said, but teacher personalities and priorities usually minimize this hazard.

According to TIM format behavioral objectives require two components: (a) behavior, action that the student will perform and (b) statement of learning, new knowledge which that action will demonstrate. Optional components of behavioral objectives may describe conditions, timing, and accuracy criteria. The teacher must satisfy the question, "How will I know what the students have learned?"

In one A&P class, the step-by-step procedure of boning a hen was used to illustrate the task analysis processes and writing of

effective objectives. The objective was stated as follows: "TLW (The Learner Will) bone a hen." This unusual example provided humor that piqued the group's curiosity and interest as they observed, listened, and participated with the professors in planning and thinking through the "boning" objective. Through this animated role play interfaced with lecture, the value and methods of task analysis for planning and writing objectives within the TIM framework were conveyed to the class. To conclude the class, Fellows grouped into pairs to write two or three objectives, then returned to the semicircle to compare and discuss their results. As usual, the objective of the lesson was used to demonstrate the concept being taught.

In another class session A&P students were informed that concept lessons, according to TIM, should be taught by Direct Instruction (DI) (see Appendix D). The prescribed components of a TIM concept lesson are the following:

1. **Set** - statement of objectives and establishment of need for the learning, relative to students' prior experiences and knowledge base;
2. **Definition of Terms** - examples (and non-examples) and checks of comprehension;
3. **Monitor and Adjust** - making appropriate revisions in plans and presentations according to students' comprehension and performance;
4. **Supervised Practice** - providing minimal assistance as students practice concept application;
5. **Closure** - reinforcement of the significance of the lesson and checking for individual students' understanding;

6. **Independent Practice** - classwork or homework assignments designed to firmly incorporate the concept into their working knowledge base.

If independent practice is to be a homework assignment closure is sometimes established before supervised practice to enable teachers to supervise initial efforts to perform the activity. The professor warned that DI is often confused with the lecture method and that, in spite of many teachers' attempts to modify each method with principles of the other, these efforts are usually in vain. In interviews, both Andrews and Amhurst bemoaned the difficulties of students and teachers attempting to satisfy requirements of TIM through direct instruction. They noticed a tendency to drift toward lecture--too much teacher-talk and not enough student interaction. Anticipating the students' difficulty with DI, the professors planned two micro-teaching sessions for Fellows to practice this strategy.

As set for the DI lesson, Andrews used a humorous approach as an attention hook that related the Fellows' previous experiences or interests to the lesson: "In this lesson the class will learn about 'TIM and Son of TIM.' We are doing porno movies with TIM. Can anyone suggest examples?"

Students randomly responded by calling out names, including "Time." Even after she became serious, some class members perseverated, impulsively calling out more answers, interrupting her definition of terms phase of the lesson. She halted this behavior by remarking that sometimes a warm-up exercise can be overly stimulating and distracting. The class settled down and the lesson continued. She mixed questions and information to demonstrate

effective and ineffective methods of checking for concept comprehension. In closure she referred to the homework which she had returned at the beginning of the class period; there were examples of good and poor set construction. By this time students had had opportunity to read the copious feedback notes Andrews and Amhurst had written on their plans for doing set, so the closure reinforced those communications.

Practice of Teaching

Analysis of effective teaching practices was enhanced by weekly application or practice sessions in micro-teaching labs. On each Friday the cohort divided and met in separate classrooms. One group met with Amhurst and the other with Andrews from 8:15 A.M. until noon, with a break midway. These sessions were sometimes stressful for the Fellows because they were self-conscious about their own teaching. Tensions were relieved, however, during the break when the students and professors drank soft drinks, smoked, and engaged in animated conversations about the work they were doing. In class each Fellow taught a brief lesson to the group. They practiced the of teaching strategy studied during the week and corrected imperfections noted from the previous week's lessons.

Class Structure and Procedure

There were differences in the small group class atmospheres, probably influenced by one or more of the following factors associated with differences in (a) classroom size, (b) group composition, or (c) personalities of the professors. The group which met with Dr.

Amhurst in the smaller (half-sized) classroom appeared to be more intimate and relaxed than Dr. Andrews' group in the larger (double-sized) classroom. Andrews' group seemed to be more conscious of a teaching posture, almost as if there were actually more students present.

All Fellows' micro-teaching lessons were videotaped and underwent a three-step review process. First, during the live teaching session the professors wrote supportive and instructive notes in margins of the lesson plans accompanying the lesson. Second, one professor observed the videotape of the lesson and wrote additional comments in the margins of the lesson plans. Two colors of ink were used for writing comments. One color was used for live observations and another for tape reviews because different qualities and tendencies were noticeable during the separate viewings. Finally, before the Fellows read professorial critiques they were required to view their own lessons and note their own observations about their teaching. Many remarked that they could see and feel great strides of progress resulting from this varied feedback. One consistent observation was that nervousness was more obvious during live presentations than it was during tape viewings. Style was noticeable to these practiced learners in live situations, whereas content and organization took priority when emotional factors receded under scrutiny of technical viewings.

The first video was simply an introduction to the camera. The students stated their names and gave a little information about themselves. Andrews referred to this activity with a chuckle: "That's how I learned their names. I took the tape home and played

it on the VCR." She added that this initial taping allowed the fellows to "get over the hurdle of being embarrassed. They laughed and pointed things out, and became accustomed to seeing and hearing themselves on the screen." All subsequent tapings were of lesson presentations, in which some students continued to begin self-consciously, but all seemed concerned with progressive improvement.

Emphasizing the value she placed on the use of video equipment, Amhurst once said, " I see so much more on the tape that I've begun to glance at the monitor screen during the lessons, just to compare my impressions." Andrews, who had no monitor in her classroom, was also convinced that she could more completely analyze students' practices when she had the films to view than she would have otherwise. Originally they planned to observe tapes of each other's groups, but time complications interfered. They felt that prompt feedback, essential to student progress, outweighed the benefits of their both observing all students teach; they monitored and adjusted.

Problems

There were several technical problems associated with videotaping. The Fellows who operated the cameras had completed one general course in operation of technical equipment. No experienced person was available to assist when problems occurred. "The objective of this class," Andrews explained, "is to attend to analysis and procedure directly related to developing and presenting lessons...not to operating equipment." Several times the cameras

contained insufficient film, and frequent delays resulted from the necessity of locating and moving the cameras. Another difficulty arose when the lessons being filmed required the use of an overhead projector. Brightness on the screen created a glare which distorted the pictures and distracted from the performances. Usually, however, the tapings went smoothly, especially after students gained experience with the equipment.

Amhurst and Andrews felt that student viewings were much more helpful when done in small groups to enable peer feedback, but monitors were located in the college's Learning Resources Center and only one student at a time could use the earphones. Despite these difficulties the professors persevered, and students expressed belief that taping experiences enhanced their self-evaluation and confidence.

Professional Participation

Doctors Andrews and Amhurst originally intended for the micro-teaching lessons to be seven to ten minutes in length in order to record all 12-13 lessons in the time allotted, but many students exceeded the time limits until they developed a sense of timing. In their efforts to be thorough and because of inexperience, some of the initial lessons dragged well beyond the limits. Both professors endured these lengthy performances and suffered considerable inconvenience. Once, on the day of lecture sessions, Dr. Amhurst was late for a dissertation review because of students' overtime. She was good-natured about the problem but she also made the class aware of it. Her reluctance to interrupt or postpone the lectures was

typical of her concern for her students' seriousness about their work. She seemed always to create the impression that the immediate concern was her greatest concern. Dr. Andrews said that her group became self-limiting after an occasion when lessons were so lengthy that a make-up class became necessary. In word and deed she indicated that the best lessons are learned through natural consequences or results of behavior.

Neither Dr. Andrews nor Dr. Amhurst interrupted the micro-teaching lessons with questions or instructions. If students requested "time" signals, the instructors complied. When it became absolutely necessary to assist a student to closure it seemed to create discomfort for everyone in the classroom. Between presentations the professors made brief comments. Andrews usually joked about material content or mentioned instances when a class of children might have seized an opportunity to distract or misbehave. Amhurst's remarks frequently called attention to effective expressions or techniques employed by the teaching student. In all cases these interjections seemed to reduce tension and assist transition as well as to remind the class of teacher presence, attention, and interest.

Student Participation

The student audience was nearly always supportive of the teaching students. They asked and answered questions which assisted the instructional rhythm and flow. Gallant efforts to proceed with discussions supported lessons in which objectives were unclear, and interest in the various topics seemed genuine. When

interest lagged, politeness took over, and only occasionally did some of the Fellows take clandestine glances at their own lesson preparations.

Delivery styles and methods of maintaining class interest varied considerably. Some students were very methodical and direct; others used few notes and meandered through their lessons. Many incorporated facial expressions and gestures, some mechanical and others natural and relaxed. About half of them stood in place behind a podium or beside a desk; the others moved about the front of the classroom as they spoke. All of those observed appeared to be "performing", but several began to project toward the class instead of simply drawing attention to themselves. Dr. Andrews once suggested that a class in drama and acting would benefit most prospective teachers. The content of most lessons revealed the students' interest in and command of subject content.

Only once did a professor express great doubts about a student's capabilities. Dr. Andrews became agitated during a discussion lesson in which the objective and direction were entirely vague. She confided that she had spoken privately with the student on numerous occasions about clarifying intentions, but there seemed to be little improvement. She did speculate, however that this particular student's mannerisms and posture were likely to be effective in student behavior management .

As they taught, the students maintained eye contact with class members and they changed focus regularly. They spoke clearly and with adequate volume, almost without exception. In most cases they described purposes and objectives, frequently writing objectives and

lead questions on the chalkboard, TIM style (e.g.," TLW use variables to write algebraic expressions"). They attempted to avoid such subjective verbs as "understand," "learn," "know," and "observe," as they had been instructed. Professorial comments in the margins of lesson plans warned against such objectives as "TLW examine...." Most students taught without visual aids, but some materials were used, including the following: handouts of pictures, charts, and diagrams; books containing illustrations or graphs; transparencies prepared in advance; chalkboard drawings, charts, and guide questions. Many lessons ended with assignments, adding to the illusion of an actual classroom teaching experience.

Cooperative Team Teaching

At all times Drs. Andrews and Amhurst functioned as a team. They planned together, consulted regularly, graded tests together, and talked after classes to evaluate themselves as well as the performance of their students. As time progressed they monitored and adjusted, mutually agreeing upon alterations based on priority issues. Their flexibility, concern, and humor were displayed in and out of the classroom; their philosophy, goals, objectives, and assessments were in harmony while their individual personalities and styles remained unique. The students' posture and conversation indicated their respect for and growing friendship with these very involved educators.

Evaluation

Mid-term and final examinations were structured to require that students consider all aspects of their instruction, apply recently acquired concepts, and create practical solutions for hypothetical situations. Some of the questions called for specific answers while others could be answered in more than one way. Students were required to formulate and defend ideas by writing brief statements or paragraphs founded upon sound educational principles. Both professors read every test paper. Each used a different color of ink to comment in the margins. When they received their graded mid-term exams, the students were intense as they examined the remarks. Questions flew about the classroom in whispers, murmurs, and louder verbalizations. Students compared test papers, and professors consulted with individuals and groups. Reactions ranged through pride, dismay, confusion, relief, and exhaltation. Student concern for excellence and grades dominated the atmosphere, and one state of mind was conspicuously absent--apathy!

Closure

To finalize the term and to graduate into the world of functioning teacher internship, the class attended a party in the recreation room of the apartment complex where Dr. Andrews lived. This cohort gathered for a relaxed evening during which they introduced special friends and spouses to their newfound peers. The occasion was informal and spirited, filled with preprofessional pride, plans, and apprehension. Small groups formed, grew, and divided like brightly colored images in a kaleidoscope. Ideas about the

coming school year slipped, bumped, and flew as the Fellows revised and restated them before a new, interested audience. Working together in "Analysis and Practices in Teaching", assessment, reading, and special education these teachers in preparation had formed a new social unit...and in the middle of it all, Dr. Amhurst was heard to exclaim, "Christmas, we'll do this at my house!"

Summary

This paper describes the "Analysis and Practices" class as it was taught in the summer of 1988 MAT Program. Course goals were observed to be accomplished as the Fellows demonstrated their ability to write lesson plans according to Tennessee guidelines, implement the plans using the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM), utilize discovery learning, discussion, and questioning techniques, and vary techniques according to content demands.

Several of Mortimer Adler's ideas regarding didactic teaching, coaching, and seminars were taught and implemented by the team teaching professors, assisted by the active and enthusiastic participation of the Fellows. Flexible use of teaching methods involving active student learning was taught and encouraged. TIM was modeled by the professors and thoroughly examined, applied and practiced by the students. Emphasis was on the components of Direct Instruction (DI): set, definition of terms, monitoring and adjusting, supervised practice, closure, and independent practice.

In addition to meeting stated goals the professors modeled other desirable pedagogical behaviors. Especially observable were their enjoyment of their work, their dedication and commitment to

excellence, their genuine and expressed interest in the students as individuals and as a group, and their professional team teaching.

Through the video taped micro teaching practice sessions students became accustomed to observing their own teaching behaviors and being observed and scrutinized. Analyzing their own teaching practices and receiving feedback from peers and professors became routine. As they worked together the cohort became a cohesive group. Fellows seemed to have developed a sense of belonging and an increased conceptualization of teaching as a profession.

Discussion

For the students in the A & P class the format seemed to be effective. It was time intensive and often threatening to them but they took pride in their efforts and came to view self analysis and feedback as professional necessities. The micro teaching with its public analysis and feedback was viewed by previous students (Etheridge, 1986) as an important component of their teacher preparation. The cohort, seminar, and micro-teaching combination provided a positive milieu in which the beginning teachers learned that being observed and critiqued could be an opportunity for growth. This perspective seems necessary for teachers in this age of evaluation.

In addition, the beginning teachers' sense of pride that seemed to enhance their view of teaching as a profession was an important intangible outcome that is necessary for upgrading the profession.

For the professors, the format was enjoyable but stressful. They were committed to the necessity of every component. Their time commitment, however, distracted from other professional activities like research and writing. Thus, unless university reward systems are adjusted to accommodate such time-intense methods, it may be difficult to find professors willing to engage them.

References

Adler, Mortimer. (1982). Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Adler, Mortimer. (1983). Paideia problems and possibilities. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Adler, Mortimer. (1984). Paideia program: An educational syllabus. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Butler, E. and James, T. (1987, November). Overview of three teacher induction schemes and theoretical rationale for the research design. Paper presented at the meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, AL.

Etheridge, C. P. (1986). The students' perspective: MAT program, cycle 1. Memphis, TN: Memphis State University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 838).

Spradley, J. P. (1980). The ethnographic interview. NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Tennessee State Department of Education. (1985). Tennessee career development program. Nashville, TN: Author.

Appendix A

EDUC 7000 Methods Component Syllabus

TEXTBOOKS:

Adler, M. The Paideia Program
Adler, M. The Paideia Proposal

*Reading assignments in textbooks and other materials will be made on a weekly basis.

TOPICS:

Lesson Planning
Behavioral Objectives
Bloom's Taxonmony
Tennessee Instructional Model TIM
Direct Instruction
Error Analysis
Lesson Revisions
Lecture Techniques
Modeling
Coaching
Questioning
Discovery Learning
Discussion
Seminars
Interdisciplinary Teaching

FORMAT:

June 3- June 10	Lecture, M,T,W	8:15 - 9:45
	Discussion, Th	8:15 - 9:45
June 13-June 17	Lecture, Tues	8:15 - 9:45
	Discussion, Th	8:15 - 9:45
June 20-July 22	Lecture, Tues	8:30 - 10:00
	Discussion, Th	8:30 - 10:00
July 25-Aug. 11	Lecture M,T,W	8:15 - 9:45
	Discussion, Th	8:15 - 9:45
**June 10-Aug 5	Microteaching, F	8:15 - 12:00
		*8:30 6/20-7/21

IMPORTANT DATES:

July 14	Midterm Exam
July 21	Project Due
August 10	NO CLASS, Library Day
August 11	Paper Due
August 12	Final Exam

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

Midterm Exam	30%
Project	30%
Final	30%
Paper	120%

The requirements for this component comprise half the grade for EDUC 7000. DON'T PANIC! We'll explain as we go along.

Appendix B

Adopting Paideia to the MAT

Anne Troutman

The Revolution in Memphis, Tennessee, have come on Thursday, not Wednesday, but it's coming. Under a three-year grant from the Tennessee State Board of Regents two graduate programs at the College of Education at Memphis, State University have received special funding and been designated a Center of Excellence in Teacher Education. In one of these programs leading to the Degree, Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), Paideia principles and teaching methods have been incorporated since its beginning in 1985.

The MAT program (which presently includes only prospective secondary teachers) is quite different from traditional teacher education programs in several ways. All students admitted hold undergraduate degrees in subject fields. Some have recently completed their undergraduate education, others have worked in business, in the military, or as homemakers for many years. Entrance requirements are stringent as the demands fo the program are heavy. Students are admitted once a year and complete the program as cohort, taking most of their classes together. The program starts in June and is completed, including the writing of a thesis, in 15 months. Students receive tuition grants and small stipends and are designated Fellows. Because all the students are well-prepared in their subject fields, and most are well along toward becoming educated persons, the goal of the program is to prepare them to help young people learn. Students are introduced to Paideia

during the first summer. The Paideia Proposal and The Paideia Program are required texts. What makes the program unique, however, is not that the students learn about Paideia but that they live it. Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, the Fellows receive didactic instruction from a team of three faculty members Thursday, a 2-hour seminar is held. (Unfortunately, scheduling constraints prevented our participating in the Wednesday Revolution, but a Thursday Revolution appears effective.) Seminars have been held only on **The Paideia Proposal** thus far, simply because requiring students to read works not directly related to education seemed too revolutionary to some faculty members.

On Friday a four-hour block of time is devoted to coaching. Fellows practice several didactic instruction techniques and coaching strategies as well as serving as seminar leaders. Each student's performance is videotaped and critiqued by faculty members, fellow students, and the student himself. This process, repeated weekly throughout the summer term, is enormously effective in refining skills.

The Fellows begin a year-long internship in the fall with master teachers in the public schools. Faculty members from the College of Education continue to coach small groups of student--from 4 to 6--throughout the year. The seminars continue on a weekly basis during the internship, and this year we will be allowed to use more varied readings. We plan to begin in the fall, inevitably, with Plato's Apology.

The program is exciting for both faculty and students. The most positive response has been to the seminars. Nobody ever cuts

class on Thursday; the discussions continue in the halls, the cafeteria, faculty members' offices,a dn local coffee shops and other gathering places (where they sometimes, we understand, become acrimoniuous.)

We believe that infusing several dozen bright, committed Paideia converts into the schools of Memphis and Shelby County each year will surely affect educational practices. We also believe that many of our graduates will ultimately hold positions of authority in those schools. There were 12 students in the first cycle, 36 in the second, and there are 24 in the present cohort. WE hope to be able in the near future to include prospective elementary teachers.

We already see results. Our Fellows receive high evaluations from local school systems during their internships and afterward. While that is gratifying, it is more exciting to observe what is happening in classrooms. We see interns arranging desks in horseshoes and finding ways to hold seminars even within the constraints of the 55-minute hours. We hear interns report that their so-called low achievers can think and will think if taught properly. Best of all, we hear agitation for Revolution, even if not on Wednesday.

Appendix C

Lesson Plan Guide

LESSON PLAN

GOAL

OBJECTIVE

MATERIALS

PROCEDURE

EVALUATION

Appendix D

Direct Instruction

OBJECTIVES

Explain the circumstances under which it is appropriate to use Direct Instruction (DI).

List the components of the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM) Lesson Design.

LABORATORY COMPONENT

Design and present a concept lesson using the TIM components.

Design and present a skill lesson incorporating modeling using the TIM components.

OVERVIEW

Direct instruction is a method of teaching in which a teacher explicitly tells students facts, defines concepts, or demonstrates skills. It is an efficient means off conveying information when the teacher's goal for the students to learn some narrowly defined concept or skill, such as, for example, the concept of a noun or the skill of determining longitude and latitude. It is most appropriately used when introducing new material or teaching basic skills. DI is the method of choice when there is one correct answer or one correct way of performing a skill. DI is also the most effective way to teach most things to students of limited intellectual ability.

TENNESSEE INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL

One model of Direct Instruction is the Tennessee Instructional Model, developed by the Tennessee State Department of Education for use in public and state-approved schools. All teachers in Tennessee public schools are required to demonstrate mastery of TIM and to use it in their classrooms to teach basic skills and concepts.

TIM LESSON DESIGN COMPONENTS

The lesson components described in TIM are very similar to the Instructional Guidelines presented in Chapter 3. The components of a TIM lesson are:

I. Instructional Objectives
II. Set
III. Instruction
IV. Closure
V. Options

The chart in the appendix compares the two. (See Comparison of TIM Model and Instructional Guideline Model.) The primary difference in the two models is in terminology. Lessons are planned and set up in a very similar manner.

INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

According to TIM, instructional objectives have two necessary components:

Learning and
behavior,

and two optional components:

conditions and

level of performance.

Most daily objects can be stated in the simple form:

The students will -- (behavior----------(learning)--------.

For example:

The students will write behavior The meanings of the vocabulary words. learning

The students will compute behavior the area of the square. learning

The students will state orally behavior The product of 100 and any other number. learning

Conditions and criteria (level of performance) may be added if necessary.

SET

The instructional component of SET also has two required and two optional parts. Required are:

label the learning

involve all students.

The optional steps are:

Relate to previous learning

Relate to real life experience.

Every TIM Lesson must begin with labeling the learning. Students are to be told what the instructional objective for the lesson is. Every student is to be involved in some way -- by responding orally to a question, by writing something; the two optional steps often provide ways to do this. Students may be asked to respond if they have learned something previously to demonstrate some previous learning, or to describe a real life experience related to the lesson.

INSTRUCTION

The instruction component of TIM has two parts:

Input

Monitor and Adjust

The TIM manual describes these processes as follows:

The next component in the lesson design is called Instruction. This component introduces new information, problems, tasks, or procedures clearly and logically and in sequence so that maximum learning may be achieved. The teacher uses whatever method and techniques are most suitable and helpful. Th instruction may come from the teacher, a book, film, records, instruction film strips, diagram, pictures, real object, demonstration, or a combination oft these. During the Instructional component, the teacher and student must interact; the teacher must build interaction into the instructional design to keep all students active so the teacher can check on the student's progress and adapt accordingly. Monitoring and adjusting is an essential element of instruction. Interactive instruction allows the teacher to check for understanding. The teacher needs to check for the student's possession of essential

information and also needs to observe students' performance to make sure they exhibit the skills necessary to achieve the instructional objective.

Checking for understanding may be accomplished by asking for unison responses, responses from individual members of the group, or for signaled responses -- asking students to give a thumbs-up signal if a word is a noun, thumbs-down if it is not, for example.

MODELING

Input for a lesson where a skill or process is being taught may be in the form of modeling. The teacher shows the students what to do. There are four steps in modeling:

1. I'll do one
2. I'll do one, you help.
3. You do one, I'll help you.
4. You do one.

CLOSURE

The TIM manual describes closure as follows:

Closure is a part of the lesson design that is intended to solidify the learning for the student and provide feedback for the teacher. in closure, the teacher provides the students with an opportunity to summarize information. What the teacher guess from summary activities is information to be used in deciding whether the student needs practice, reteaching, or is ready to move on. The Closure involves all students in active participation activities, either orally or in writing. These activities emphasize critical points and allow the

student to pull all parts together. A good Closure activity has two important components:

1. Active participation involving all learners -- one more example
2. Student summarizes what has been learned.

OPTIONS

Options in the Lesson Design include independent practice, enrichment, and reteaching. Depending on the feed the teacher has received, he or she may elect om provide one, two, or all three options -- enrichment for the students who have thoroughly mastered the lesson, independent practice for those whose mastery is less completed, and reteaching for those who have failed to reach the objective. The teacher may teach a lesson to the entire class and then break the students into small groups -- one group perhaps engaging in a problem-solving activity, one group practicing the learning of using a worksheet or exercise from the text, and the third group remaining with the teacher for additional help.